



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,784	09/29/2006	Hideyuki Ono	121036-0096	7107
35684	7590	11/10/2008	EXAMINER	
BUTZEL LONG			RONESL VICKERY M	
IP DOCKETING DEPT			ART UNIT	
350 SOUTH MAIN STREET			PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 300			1796	
ANN ARBOR, MI 48104			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			11/10/2008	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT@BUTZEL.COM
BOUDRIE@BUTZEL.COM

Attachment to Advisory Action

While Examiner Reddy is on leave, Examiner Ronesi has considered the amendment filed on 9/22/2008 in her absence. The present application remains docketed to Examiner Reddy.

Applicant's response filed 9/22/2008 has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Specifically, applicant argues (A) that Moriyama et al teaches away from using vulcanization accelerators other than guanidine; (B) that Hiramatsu et al fails to disclose carboxyl-group containing acrylic elastomer; and (C) that the thiazole-based compounds do not function as vulcanization promoters in the instant invention.

With respect to argument (A), the examiner agrees, however, Hiramatsu et al does not teach that thiazole-based compounds are vulcanization accelerators. Rather, Hiramatsu et al teaches thiazole-based compounds as crosslinking agents.

With respect to argument (B), the crosslinking agents taught by Hiramatsu et al react with the pendant double bonds of an elastomer. Given that Moriyama et al also teaches elastomers with pendant double bonds (col. 3, line 18), the thiazole-based crosslinking agents of Hiramatsu et al can and should be combined with the diene-containing elastomers taught by Moriyama et al. Case law holds that it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather Hiramatsu et al teaches a certain concept, and in combination with the primary reference, discloses the presently claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1796

With respect to argument (C), case law holds that the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Therefore, it still would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the thiazole-based crosslinking agent of Hiramatsu et al in the composition taught by Moriayama et al.

10/27/2008

Vickey Ronesi

/V. R./

Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/Vasu Jagannathan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796